

September 26, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 9207

only to the military conflict, but its interrelationship with Southeast Asia, as well as the new belligerency of the Soviet Union in other parts of the world.

Upon conclusion of this new reappraisal of the situation and its impact on world events, I would hope that the new President would come to the Congress and to the American people to fully report what he found and what needs to be done.

Let me make one point unmistakably clear. As pointed out in the Freedom House article, the precise execution, and I emphasize the word "precise" of foreign and military policies is necessarily that of the President and his diplomatic and military advisers. They are the only ones who have full access to all military and diplomatic information that is needed to decide what may be the best course of action. The strategies of peace and war cannot be based on sentimentality, wishes, or even dreams, but must be decided on the cold facts of reality. There may come a time when we may want to take a calculated risk for peace, such as stopping the bombing, but it must be a decision based on facts and not the emotionalism of the moment. Let no one forget that the lives of American men are at stake.

It has been, and continues to be, my policy as a Member of Congress to fully support the American troops. For that reason I have, without exception, voted for the military appropriations asked for by the President.

A stable and peaceful order must continue to be our goal in world affairs. And let no one be mistaken, there are no quick or easy solutions to this most complex problem of international peace. Be wary of those who promise easy solutions. I know that the people of this country, given the full facts, will support whatever action is necessary to bring an honorable and durable peace to Vietnam.

The article previously mentioned, follows:

GUIDELINES FOR DEBATING FOREIGN POLICY

On the war in Vietnam, the fact is that talks are finally under way in Paris, and have been for some months. The uncertainties are whether these talks will become more serious and more productive, and whether the current American negotiating strategy is conducive to this end. While differences of opinion are inevitable on this latter question, only the Administration that is in power until January 20 can conduct these talks—and the war—according to strategies it deems appropriate. Responsible dissent can be, and perhaps already has been, constructive. Nonetheless it is incumbent on all political aspirants in this campaign to keep their dissent responsible, and to do or say nothing that will encourage further procrastination or fresh miscalculations on the part of Hanoi, or undercut the American negotiating team's pursuit in Paris of a durable Vietnam peace.

Broad goals and even means of foreign policy, as well as national military commitments, are very properly the subject of continuing public debate. At the same time, the precise execution of foreign policy, in general, and military policy, in particular, can only be the responsibility of the public officials who are Constitutionally charged with these responsibilities. The ultimate recourse of opposition is the ballot box on November 5, not independent diplomacy by private citizens or the candidates before they have received an electoral mandate.

The broadest issue in the foreign-policy debate is how and for what purposes the United States shall use its power and resources in the world. We remind all political leaders in this campaign that this nation cannot avoid influencing the future course of history and the emerging structure of the changing world system. Our economic, cultural and military influence is a reality everywhere, whether we like it or not. To refuse to use this influence constructively is to use it negatively, at the risk of dire consequences to world stability and our own security. Conversely, to dissipate our power and resources where the stakes are ambiguous may deny us a decisive voice in another, more serious crisis in some other place or time.

The choices are never easy but to sustain our role in a critical, prolonged and costly test is even more difficult. *What we have been in danger of losing is our sense, as a nation, of the responsibilities we cannot abdicate.*

In this adversarial world system, American policy and power have been, for more than two decades, the principal deterrents to aggression, and economic and political anarchy in the world. On some occasions we have perhaps overreacted, and on others we have no doubt underreacted. But current events in Central Europe once again demonstrate that freedom is still being brutally challenged in the world. The United States supports self-determination and freedom from external coercion in Vietnam as elsewhere. The Soviet Union has displayed in Czechoslovakia, as it has in other places, its callous indifference to self-determination and its fear of freedom.

The diplomatic olive branches we have held out to the Soviet Union have not modified its hostility to the freedoms we regard as fundamental. The dreams of "detente" and "convergence"—like the Czechoslovak dream of gradual emancipation of its own society—have been brutally interrupted. This is a warning—a revelation of reality—that must not be lost on the American people and their leaders during this campaign, nor after a new leadership takes office in January.

A stable and peaceful order must continue to be our goal in the world as it is in our own cities. Diplomatic agreements which promote stability, such as the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, should be pursued. At the same time, we must not make accommodations in Europe, Asia or elsewhere that have the effect of condoning or ratifying aggression and the undermining of stability and peaceful order.

We call on all candidates, and all spokesmen for special views and causes, to observe decent limits to their partisanship and dissent. We ask a renewal of that basic unity of national purpose that recognizes America's historical commitment—and momentum—to the strengthening of freedom at home and in the world.

CURTAILMENT OF HIGHWAY FUNDS FLOUTS THE WILL OF CONGRESS

(Mr. LLOYD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation has announced that its decision to defer \$200 million in expenditures from the highway trust fund is in response to the congressional order for \$6 billion in spending reductions for fiscal 1969.

Admittedly, this represents \$200 million worth of checks that the Federal Government will not write during this fiscal year. However, it was not the intent of Congress in passing the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act that the Fed-

eral-aid highway program should be deferred.

Moneys from the highway trust fund are dedicated funds financed from highway user fees. Deferral of those funds does not represent a spending reduction inasmuch as the funds will continue to grow, and will be spent at a later date. Instead of reducing spending by \$200 million, the Department of Transportation is simply postponing it while costs of construction continue to rise.

Not only does this action violate the intent of Congress in passing the spending reduction requirement, it clearly flouts the will of Congress as expressed in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968. Section 15 of that act states:

It is the sense of Congress that under existing law no part of (Highway Trust Funds) shall be impounded or withheld from obligation.

Officials of the Department of Transportation tell me this spending reduction is a weapon against inflation. That is nonsense because this represents deferred spending and the impact of deferred spending is more damaging than orderly spending.

The damage inflicted on the States and the construction industry by making it impossible to plan an orderly construction program is unconscionable. This stop-and-start Federal policy on the highway program makes it impossible for States and the construction industry to efficiently carry out construction, thus increasing the costs of highways to the public.

Many States, my State of Utah included, would now be at the height of their contract awards, so successful bidders could begin planning for the job and accomplishing the necessary details to allow them to begin construction as soon as weather permits next spring. Because of this deferral, roadbuilders and professional personnel in the State highway departments are faced with frustration and injury.

Under two previous cutbacks during the past 2 years, the program continued at reduced levels. This latest action leaves no discretion to the States to proceed with high priority projects, meaning that some States will have to bear a disproportionate share of the cutback depending on their program and work schedule.

Mr. Speaker, this action is contrary to the will expressed by Congress, unresponsive to the direction to reduce expenditures, damaging to the States and the highway construction industry and suppliers, and clearly against the public interest. The reason given for such irresponsible action deliberately flouts the Congress of the United States.

CONDEMNATION OF AGGRESSION BY THE SOVIET UNION AND ITS SATELLITES AGAINST CZECHOSLOVAKIA

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce into the Record the resolu-

tion adopted on September 16 by the Parma, Ohio, City Council, condemning the brutal and unprovoked aggression by the Soviet Union and its satellites against Czechoslovakia.

At the same time I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed therein, and to call the attention of this House to the resolution I introduced on March 20, 1968, House Concurrent Resolution 724.

My resolution would authorize and instruct the President of the United States to direct our Ambassador to the United Nations to request at this year's session that the U.N. insist on fulfillment of its charter provisions calling for sovereign equality of states and condemning colonial rule.

It also directs that the Soviet Union be asked to abide by its U.N. membership obligations by withdrawing all its troops and agents from other nations and by returning all Communist-held political prisoners to their homelands.

And, finally, my resolution authorizes and directs the President of the United States to use all diplomatic, treaty-making, and appointive powers vested in him by the Constitution to augment and support actions taken by the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. in the interest of self-determination and political independence of these captive nations.

I personally discussed my resolution with the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs shortly after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. We agreed that the measure was very pertinent to the crisis which exists and I have been hopeful that the committee will act on it.

I urge those who serve on the committee to consider the resolution adopted by the Parma City Council and, in the light of these sentiments, to give my pending legislation the earliest possible action.

RESOLUTION NO. 53-68: A RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE BRUTAL AND UNPROVOKED AGGRESSION BY THE SOVIET UNION AND ITS SATELLITES AGAINST CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Whereas, We, the American People, protest against the brutal and unprovoked aggression by the Soviet Union and its satellites against Czechoslovakia; and

Whereas, We, the American People, condemn this invasion as a dastardly, ruthless violation of the rights of self-determination and of all fundamental human rights. This attack violates the laws of man, nations and of God; and

Whereas, again we have an example of the tentacles of the Soviet Union assisted by its satellites in their program of complete domination of the World of Nations to communism; and

Whereas, we again see that the force of arms will always be used to enslave the Nations of the World who oppose the purposes and the ideals of the Soviet Union and its other satellites; and

Whereas, we call upon all Americans from the lowest to those in the highest offices of the land to come to the aid of the Slovak and Czech people for the sake of the freedom and democracy we all hold so dear; Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Council of the city of Parma, County of Cuyahoga and State of Ohio:

Section 1. That this entire Parma City Council and the City Administration by John Petruska, its Mayor, Anna L. Kozusko, its Treasurer, Joseph S. Lime, its Auditor and Andrew Boyko, its Solicitor, respectfully

request: that all leaders of our State and Country come to the aid of the Slovak and Czech people for the sake of the freedom and democracy we, here, enjoy so much.

Section 2. That the Clerk of Council be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to send a certified copy of this Resolution to Governor James A. Rhodes of the State of Ohio; House of Representatives; Senators Frank J. Lausche and Stephen Young; Congressmen William Minshall, Charles Vanik, Michael Feighan; Representative Frances Bolton, and both Houses of Congress.

Section 3. That this Resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health, safety and welfare of people all over the World, and shall become immediately effective upon receiving the affirmative vote of two-thirds of all members elected to Council and approval of the Mayor, otherwise from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Adopted: September 16, 1968.

Attest: Bernard J. Survoy, Clerk of Council.
Filed with the Mayor: September 18, 1968.

PAUL J. PHILLIPS,
President of Council.

Approved: September 23, 1968.

JOHN PETRUSKA,
Mayor, City of Parma, Ohio.

POSTAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1968

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today recommended by the Postmaster General, to modernize postal transportation laws and provide the Postmaster General greater flexibility in the procurement of transportation of mail by railway, airplane, and motor vehicle.

I first sponsored legislation on this subject in 1965 during the 89th Congress. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I conducted extensive studies and reviews of the laws and regulations controlling the transportation of mail during 1965 and 1966.

Our subcommittee considered several proposals for changing the transportation laws at that time, but we were not able to reach any agreement during the 89th Congress. Early in the 90th Congress, I again sponsored legislation to revise the laws for transportation of mail. The Postmaster General also has been conducting extensive studies on this matter during these 3 years. This legislation is the result of our combined studies.

I have reservations about some of the recommendations made by the Postmaster General. However, his proposal will carry out, in a major part, the recommendations made by the President's Commission on Postal Organization.

It is stated on page 171 of the Commission's report that "postal managers should have the authority to select whatever means of transportation is best suited to the needs of the postal service."

The report of Arthur D. Little, Inc., which made the special study for the President's Commission on Postal Organization, points out:

The Bureau of Transportation is limited in its choice of carrier by Government regu-

lation, which fixes rates for air movements, prohibits the use of freight forwarders, and prohibits . . . shipments via (highway) common carriers. (The postal) service does not have the same latitude to negotiate for the best terms (lowest cost, fastest delivery) that a similar industrial shipper does. Mail volumes between points in the system vary, and fixed capacity rate structures do not permit the minimization of costs nor even promote maximizing service.

The laws regulating the conditions under which the Postmaster General may procure transportation for mail have remained unchanged for over 30 years. These laws are based on railway transportation of passengers, and fast freight.

Today the number of daily passenger trains available to carry mail is less than 700, compared with approximately 10,000 in 1930.

I introduce the bill at this time at the request of the Postmaster General, knowing full well that no legislative action will be taken on the proposal during the 90th Congress. But I do so in order to afford all segments of the transportation industry an opportunity to become acquainted with the Postmaster General's recommendations, which are so vital to the transportation requirements of the Department in being able to handle economically the ever-increasing volume of mail.

This bill will authorize the Postmaster General to obtain transportation services for mail from regulated motor carriers and freight forwarders on exactly the same basis as he now does from the railways.

The Postmaster General will be authorized to negotiate rates of compensation with scheduled air carriers as well as railways.

The requirement that certain airport-to-post office transportation be performed by Government vehicles will be repealed.

The residence requirement for star route contractors will be repealed.

The bill will establish authority for the Postmaster General to enter into mail transportation contracts which require the use of more than one mode of transportation.

The proposed revision will extend the statutory obligation of railway common carriers to transport mail and provide related services at rates prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the two important segments of the transportation industry not now covered by any corresponding obligation—the regulated motor carriers and freight forwarders.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the authority of the Postmaster General to control and supervise the transportation of mail by all modes of transportation should be as flexible as is his present authority regarding the transportation of mail by rail. All modes of the transportation industry should be treated on an equitable and comparable basis.

While, as I have indicated, some provisions of the proposal may be found objectionable, the Postmaster General's recommendation merits extensive and serious deliberation. I will see that this action is taken during the next session of the Congress.